

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending. New claims 7-20 have been added to secure an appropriate scope of protection to which Applicants are believed entitled. Support for the added claims is believed to be found at at least page 4, lines 16-23, page 6, lines 4-20, and FIGs. 1-2.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are not anticipated by Bogin et al. (US Patent 6,192,455)

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bogin is hereby traversed. A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102 requires every element of the claim to be included in the reference, either directly or inherently. Claim 1 is patentable over Bogin because the reference fails to disclose or suggest every element of claim 1. There are at least two reasons claim 1 is patentable over Bogin.

First, Bogin fails to disclose or suggest “reporting to an operating system that a portion of the remap window is reserved” as claimed in claim 1.

Bogin appears to describe preventing access to a protected system management random access memory (SMRAM) space by the interception of an access request to the SMRAM space and re-direction of the access to a non-SMRAM space. Bogin at Abstract. Bogin fails to disclose any reporting to the operating system as claimed in the present claimed subject matter of claim 1. Bogin appears to describe the use of an AGP translator 308, as part of a host bridge 130, to intercept and re-direct SMRAM address requests received from connected devices, e.g., CPU 138, graphics device 140, devices 142, etc. Bogin at column 3, lines 20-40, column 5, line 43-63, and FIG. 3. Column 5, lines 55-63, state:

“The AGP translator 308 receives the translated address 315 and determines whether the translated address 315 is within the SMRAM address range. If the translated address 315 is not within the SMRAM address range, then the GTLB 141 is updated with a new translation entry having the request address 311 and the corresponding translated address 315. Otherwise, the translated address 315 is converted to a non-SMRAM address.”

There is no disclosure of the AGP translator 308 reporting to the operating system regarding the SMRAM address range. That is, the operating system of Bogin appears to be unaware of the SMRAM address range by virtue of the AGP translator 308. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Second, the AGP aperture memory 127 is “allocated by the operating system 129 for use by the graphics device 140” and not reported to the operating system as reserved. Bogin at column 4, lines 12-13. Thus, Bogin fails to disclose reporting to the operating system regarding the AGP aperture memory 127 at column 4, lines 9-17. Column 5, lines 43-63 of Bogin have been addressed with the first point above. The PTO-identified portion of Bogin fails to disclose reporting to the operating system a reservation of a portion of the remap window. The PTO-identified portion appears to describe interception and redirection of an address as employed by Bogin without disclosing the claimed reporting as claimed in claim 1. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Third, the PTO asserts that “Bogin discloses that reserving a portion of translated memory is functionally equivalent to disabling” without identifying any support for the assertion in either of the applied references. Present Official Action at page 5, lines 17-19. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing, claim 1 is patentable over Bogin and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, and 5 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, include further limitations, and are patentable over Bogin for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1. The rejection of claims 2, 4, and 5 should be withdrawn.

New claims 7-10 and 16-19 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 4, respectively, include further limitations, and are patentable over Bogin for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 4.

Claims 3 and 6 are not obvious over Bogin in view of Campbell (US Patent 6,886,090)

The rejection of claims 3 and 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Bogin in view of Campbell is hereby traversed. Claim 3 is patentable over the combination of Bogin and Campbell for at least reasons similar to those advanced above with respect to claim 1. That is, Bogin fails to disclose “in response to queries from an operating system to a BIOS, reporting . . . a reserved range beginning at the top of the first usable range and having a size equal to AGP aperture” as claimed in claim 3. Similar to the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1, Bogin fails to disclose reporting of a reserved range and instead relies on interception and redirection by host bridge 130, and more specifically AGP translator 308, to prevent access to SMRAM space. The PTO has failed to identify any disclosure of at least reporting a reserved range in Campbell and therefore Campbell fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Bogin. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing, claim 3 is patentable over Bogin in view of Campbell and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-15 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 3, include further limitations, and are patentable over Bogin in view of Campbell for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 3. The rejection of claims 11-15 should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is patentable over Bogin in view of Campbell for at least reasons similar to those advanced above with respect to claim 3 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 depends, either directly or indirectly, from claim 6, includes further limitations, and is patentable over Bogin in view of Campbell for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 3. The rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimon Berlin



Randy A. Noranbrock
Registration No. 42,940
Telephone: (703) 684-1111

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599
Telephone: (970) 898-7057
Facsimile: 281-926-7212
Date: **February 26, 2007**
RAN/